



May 28, 2010

Reply to Attn. of: A/D-1422/RMS

Memorandum for the Record

FROM: A/Deputy Chief, Acquisition Management Office

SUBJECT: Source Selection Statement under Request for Quote (RFQ)
DD10330830Q, Engineering and Technical Support Services for
CONOPS Development

This memorandum documents the basis for my decision as Source Selection Authority (SSA) to select Science Application International Corporation (SAIC) of Beavercreek, OH for Call Order award under the subject solicitation.

A. Procurement History Narrative

The procurement was solicited and evaluated under the provisions of Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and NASA FAR Supplement Part 13.303-5, "Purchases under BPAs [Blanket Purchase Agreements]." The intent of this procurement is to award a Call Order against an existing DFRC BPA for effort specified in the solicitation's Statement of Work (SOW) dated March 23, 2010. An Evaluation Plan, dated March 9, 2010, identified guidance utilized by the Government's evaluation team in performing their assessment of each proposal.

The RFQ was issued on March 11, 2010, to five firms that have BPAs related to this effort. It included the following salient evaluation aspects:

- Technical Evaluation
 - Staffing: Knowledge and understanding possessed by proposed staffing, including identified key personnel
 - Understanding the Requirement: How well the Offeror understands the technical requirements of this procurement
 - Assign an overall assessment characteristic of excellent, very good, fair, or poor to the technical proposal
- Past Performance Evaluation
 - Quality of past performance
 - Currency and relevance of performance
 - Assign an adjectival characteristic of excellent, very good, fair, poor or neutral.

- Price Evaluation
 - Determination if price is fair and reasonable
 - Reflects potential Government risk
- Evaluation Criteria Weighting

The two technical areas (technical understanding, staffing) are each approximately equal in value and, when combined, are slightly more important than past performance. Price is the least important factor.

Proposals were received from the following two Offerors on the submission due date of March 26, 2010:

SAIC of Beavercreek, OH
Tybrin Corporation of Fort Walton Beach, FL

No late proposals were received.

B. Findings Narrative

The Government evaluation team's findings were summarized in a presentation to the SSA on May 25, 2010. I am confident that those results form a solid basis upon which I may make this selection decision.

The technical proposal from SAIC was found to have the following four significant strengths:

1. Offeror demonstrates understanding of current state of Unmanned Air Systems (UAS) access, as well as NextGen constraints and assumptions. They have knowledge of UAS NAS Access technical efforts, support of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Unmanned Aircraft Program Office, and the FAA Aviation Safety NextGen implementation plan. Furthermore, SAIC demonstrates understanding of UAS categorization schemes and the breadth of UAS stakeholders.
2. The Offeror provides a thoughtful and iterative approach to each task. This includes an exhaustive survey of sources in generating input to the draft UAS State of the Art (SOA) Assessment, delivery of a very specific SOA Assessment, detailed process for identifying constraints and assumptions in areas pertinent to UAS capabilities in the US NAS NextGen end state, and a disciplined method for reviewing draft documents in accordance with their established and audited ISO processes.
3. Proposed staffing demonstrates experience in integrating UAS into NAS, requirements and system architecture development for "file and fly" efforts, assessing operational issues of deploying in NextGen, developing standards for UAS command and control requirements, deploying new NAS systems, air traffic density studies and airspace management, and UA operations and testing. Principals have a balance of experience

between operating UAS and participating in NextGen development and implementation plans.

4. Five personnel proposed as members of Offeror's technical team possess policy-level airspace management experience including membership on RTCA Working Groups and on other bodies currently developing input for safely allowing UAS routine access to the NAS. Knowledge gained by this experience and access will be valuable in interpreting policy and in drafting and implementing regulations.

Additionally, the SAIC proposal had no regular (as distinguished from significant) strengths, two regular weaknesses and no significant weaknesses. These findings were distributed among the two technical evaluation subfactors of staffing and understanding the requirements. The evaluation team's characterization of their technical proposal is excellent.

The SAIC proposed amount is \$852,696. This is somewhat higher than the Government's estimate of \$750,000.

Relative to SAIC's past performance, there is one significant strength:

1. The offeror provided performance information on nine separate activities under eight contracts ranging in size from half the size of the effort under evaluation to more than \$100M. All of the contracts include work that is relevant to the task under consideration. Several of the contracts include work that is directly related to the proposed task and would allow the Offeror valuable insight into ongoing airspace management policy initiatives. The Offeror's performance was generally rated very good or excellent by cited customers.

There were no regular strengths, regular weaknesses or significant weaknesses in SAIC's past performance proposal. The evaluation team's characterization of their past performance is very good.

The technical proposal from Tybrin did not have any significant strengths, but did have the following three significant weaknesses:

1. Each task under this effort has two constituent components: 1) providing technical and policy input to a draft document in the areas specified in the SOW and 2) providing review comments for the draft document after the inputs of other Government agencies and industry organizations have been incorporated. Tybrin failed to provide details that demonstrate their understanding of the first component.
2. The approach to reviewing the UAS State of the Art Assessment and the NextGen ConOps are not sufficiently detailed to demonstrate a clear understanding of the tasks. It fails to specify the key content areas in document review, to specify the process to ensure the draft documents are accurate and complete, to specify the minimum requirements of the draft SOA Assessment, and to demonstrate understanding of the technical acceptance measurement requirements on pages 8 and 9 of the SOW.

3. The Offeror's proposed personnel lack policy level experience in the aggregate. Only one of three personnel proposed are or have been members of interagency or industry working groups that are contributing to the development of requirements for routine access to the NAS for UAS. The unique requirements of this task require that the selected contractor provide personnel with substantial policy-level experience, as well as field-level experience.

Additionally, the Tybrin technical proposal had two strengths and one weakness. These findings were distributed among the two technical evaluation subfactors. The evaluation team's characterization of their technical proposal is poor.

The Tybrin proposed amount of \$268,643 is considerably lower than the Government's estimate and was considered by the evaluation team as unreasonable to perform the effort described in the solicitation.

Relative to Tybrin's past performance, there are no significant strengths, one strength, no weaknesses, and no significant weaknesses. The evaluation team's characterization of Tybrin's past performance is fair.

C. Source Selection Decision

I make the following decision on the basis of an integrated assessment of all three evaluation factors.

Using the findings presented by the evaluation team in the May 25th presentation, and not taking any exceptions to the results presented, I find that the proposal from SAIC forms a solid basis for their selection and award. They have an excellent technical characterization and a very good past performance characterization. Their proposed price is about \$100,000 more than the Government's estimate, and is considered reasonable. The two weaknesses associated with their proposal involve work or labor categories in excess of the Government's expectation for this procurement and which will form a basis for negotiating a Call Order amount less than that proposed by SAIC.

I also acknowledge very serious technical risks associated with the Tybrin proposal. These include not understanding essential aspects of the SOW associated with providing imperative policy and procedural input into drafting the initial CONOPS documents (SOW deliverables 2, 3, and 4). This effort requires the expertise of personnel that understand FAA policy related to unmanned aircraft performance in the national airspace. Failure to provide substantive comments in those deliverables would likely result in unacceptable documents and jeopardize major intents of this procurement, including:

1. Addressing the capacity challenges facing the US national airspace;
2. Assessing future operational capabilities, documenting the state of the art, and identifying technology gaps; and

3. Identifying research and development needs for UAS to fly safely in the national airspace.

While the solicitation did not call for Government evaluation of proposed numbers of personnel, both SAIC and Tybrin provided that information. SAIC proposed 6,040 hours and Tybrin proposed 2,770 hours. The obvious difference between these numbers may reasonably be attributed in part to SAIC's clearer understanding of the need to provide original input to the draft documents. This difference also helps to quantify the magnitude of effort neglected in the Tybrin proposal. It is of sufficient importance to outweigh any economies associated with Tybrin's much lower proposed price.

Based upon the findings presented, and my conclusions given above, I determine that the proposal received from SAIC to be the best overall value to the Government. It is the combination of these findings, and not any single evaluation conclusion, that forms the basis for my decision. Therefore, I select SAIC for an award of a Call Order resulting from this solicitation.



Rosalia Toberman
Source Selection Authority

5/28/10
Date